DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 757 HE 033 762

AUTHOR	Wolf-Wendel, Lisa E.; Toma, J. Douglas; Morphew, Christopher C.
TITLE	How Much Difference Is Too Much Difference: Perceptions of Homosexuality in Intercollegiate Athletics. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE	2000-11-00
NOTE	33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) (25th, Sacramento, CA, November 16-19, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Athletes; *Athletic Coaches; *College Athletics; Diversity (Student); Higher Education; *Homosexuality; Interviews; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This study explored why college athletes and coaches accept some forms of diversity but are less willing to accept homosexuality. To explore how athletic teams respond to diversity, researchers visited five college campuses, interviewing athletes in higher profile sports with racial and ethnic diversity. Twelve to fifteen formal interviews or focus groups were conducted on each campus, for fifty to one hundred individuals per campus. Because team members were likely to assert heterosexist and homophobic comments around their teammates, homosexuality was explored in single interviews rather than group sessions. In general, there was a remarkably strong sense of community between and among participants on the sports teams even though the teams were marked by diversity. However, there was hostility to gays and lesbians on nearly all teams, and coaches, administrators, and athletes were all unwilling to confront and accept homosexuality. The paper discusses why this situation exists, focusing on athletics as a microcosm of society. It is also probable that athletes have more exposure to racial differences than homosexuality and that collegiate athletics as a field embodies hegemonic masculinity. It is also suggested that athletics may inhibit individual identity in efforts to achieve conformity. (Contains 64 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 757

How Much Difference is Too Much Difference:

Perceptions of Homosexuality in Intercollegiate Athletics

Lisa E. Wolf-Wendel, University of Kansas

J. Douglas Toma, University of Pennsylvania

Christopher C. Morphew, University of Kansas

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Morphew

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Sacramento, California, November 2000.

HE033762

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Athletics appears to provide a notable example in higher education of creating community across difference. Even though students involved in sports like football, basketball, and track at Division I institutions are typically a much more diverse group than students on campuses as a whole, community seems especially strong on these athletics teams. On these teams, students from a vast array of backgrounds integrate into a coherent whole, where factors such as race, socioeconomic status, and even gender (in the case of mixed gender track and field teams) assume much less meaning than what individuals can contribute to the team (Wolf-Wendel, Toma & Morphew, in press). At the same time, however, homosexuality remains a complex, potentially divisive issue in athletics. Indeed, students, coaches, and administrators alike generally express homophobic and heterosexist views. The purpose of this paper is to explore this paradox – why do student athletes and coaches accept some forms of diversity but remain closed-minded to homosexuality?

Community, Diversity and Athletics

"Community" and "diversity," as constructs, are difficult to define. We use Calderwood's (2000) definition of community. Calderwood associates several images with community – connection, caring, interdependence, shared values, rituals, and belonging to a group. The essence of amplifying these images – thus building community – is to strengthen commonalties within a group. Doing so requires effort, as community cannot be decreed but must emerge through mutual recognition and identification (Calderwood, 2000). Furthermore, community is not only a process of stressing what is common to the group, but also of accepting differences within the group. "For a social group to be a community there must be a belief that they in fact share identity, beliefs, values, practices, history and goals specific and unique to the group. . . [and] existing or potential differences between competing values, beliefs and practices

within the group must be recognized, reconciled and tolerated" (Calderwood, 2000, p. 3). Finally, community can exclude as it includes: "The impulse to community often coincides with a desire to preserve identity and in practice excludes others who threaten that sense of identity" (Calderwood, 2000, p. 12).

On American campuses, the concepts of community and diversity intersect. Smith (1995) outlines four dimensions of diversity in higher education: (1) access; (2) campus climate; (3) educational mission; and (4) institutional transformation. Our focus is on the second of these dimensions – diversity within the context of campus climate. Campus climate can shape feelings of inclusion or alienation, encourage or discourage student retention, and define positive or destructive inter-group relations. Although higher education institutions have improved access and become more inclusive, problems with campus climate persist. In concentrating on campus climate and in our use of the terms diversity and difference throughout this paper, we focus on the experiences of students who feel marginalized within higher education, including those marginalized by their race, ethnicity, gender, class and sexual orientation. By looking at climate, however, we also focus on the institutional structures that perpetuate this marginalization.

On college and university campuses, mass spectator sports like football or basketball can foster community in the most global sense. Attending games encourages what a 1990 Carnegie Report calls a "celebrative community," where the heritage of the institution is remembered and where rituals affirming both tradition and change are widely shared. Others have also noted that college sports serves as a potent source of student spirit and loyalty (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Cady, 1978; Toma & Cross, 2000). Many on campus, even those who share very little in common, can unite around the success or failure of their athletic teams. At the same time, no event or activity can unite all constituents simultaneously.

Looking at athletics on a micro-level, Levine and Cureton (1998) noted that the only exceptions they saw to the pattern of self-segregation by race on college campuses were in athletics and theater. Although they did not explore this notion in detail, Levine and Cureton hypothesized that "the close working relationships among students in these fields appeared to overcome the perception of difference looming larger than commonality" (p. 87). They further posited that "close contact and common goals appeared to be the best stereotype-busters and inducement for integration on campus" (p. 87). This idea is not new. Specifically, Allport (1954) hypothesized that prejudice between groups is lessened when the group members possess equal status, seek common goals, are dependent upon each other, and interact with the positive support of authorities. Similarly, Sherif (1961) proposed the superordinate goal hypothesis, which states that when groups of diverse individuals are seeking to achieve "compelling and highly appealing" goals and must cooperate to achieve those goals, then conflict within the group will be minimized.

In the 1970s and early 1980s, several researchers explored the applicability of Allport's and Sherif's theories to sports teams and found mixed results (Chu & Griffey, 1981; McClendon & Eitzen, 1975; Miracle, 1981; Scott, & Damico, 1984; Sigelman, & Welch, 1993). These studies concluded, for example, that white athletes participating on sports teams with African American athletes had more positive racial attitudes than those in control groups (Chu & Griffey, 1981; McClendon & Eitzen, 1975; Scott & Damico, 1984) and that the same benefits do not seem to hold for African American athletes who are on mixed teams (McClendon & Eitzen, 1975). Similarly, other studies found that the win/loss record of the team affects inter-group cooperation (McClendon & Eitzen, 1975), that the positive effects were greater for those in individual sports as compared to those in team sports (Chu & Griffey, 1981), and that the effects

of positive inter-group cooperation learned on the athletic fields do not readily occur in other venues (Miracle, 1981). All of these studies utilized quantitative experimental designs in their analyses and unfortunately, all are dated.

The studies testing Allport's and Sherif's hypotheses looked solely at differences based on race ethnicity. A different body of research has examined the role of gays and lesbians in intercollegiate athletics. Specifically, Hekma (1998) found that there is a silencing and invisibility of homosexuality in athletics. She also concluded that in cases where lesbians have become more open about their sexuality, they encounter a high level of discrimination. Indicative of the homophobic and heterosexual environment promulgated in athletics, Hekma was not able to find instances in which gay male athletes were open about their sexual orientation. Further, Harry (1995) found that sports ideology is positively associated with sexist and anti-homosexual attitudes. Rotella and Murray (1991), Dundes (1985) and Rodrigues (1993), who also write about the homophobic and heterosexist nature of sports, reinforce these findings.

It is important to note that intercollegiate athletics is not alone in its intolerance of homosexuality. Research has demonstrated that gays and lesbians in higher education are frequently victims of discrimination, negative stereotypes, and overtly hateful acts (Herek, 1993; D'Augelli, 1989). Indeed, there has been a significant body of research that demonstrates that many undergraduates hold negative and stereotypical views about gays and lesbians (Black, Oles & Moore, 1998; Eliason, 1997; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Geasler , Croteau, Heineman, & Edlund, 1995; Geller, 1991; Schellenberg, Hirt & Sears, 1999; Simoni, 1996). In particular, this research shows that men hold more negative views of homosexuality than do females (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; La Mar & Kite, 1998) and that African Americans are more likely than white

students to express homophobic sentiments (Black, Oles, & Moore, 1998). Given the relative prevalence of African Americans on Division I athletics teams (as compared with their presence on the rest of campus) and the masculine nature of sports, we might expect that big-time college sports would not provide the most homosexual-friendly environment.

What is unique about athletics in regard to the issue of homosexuality is that the homophobic views held by athletes, coaches and administrators exist in sharp contrast to their conceptualizations of other forms of difference. Athletics generally provides a powerful model for creating community from difference in terms of race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and sometimes gender (Wolf-Wendel, Toma & Morphew, in press). The extent to which those in athletics openly express hostility to gays and lesbians seems above and beyond that found on other segments of campus. We explore these issues in this paper.

Method and Analysis

To explore how athletic teams respond to different forms of diversity we visited five campuses that are representative of the different types of universities that compete at the highest and most visible level in intercollegiate athletics, Division I. In particular, we interviewed those involved in football, men's and women's basketball and men's and women's track and field. [1]. We selected these teams because they are typically diverse in terms of race and ethnicity.[2] We used purposive sampling to select these campuses in an attempt to best represent the diversity of institutions that compete at this level (Creswell, 1994; Creswell, 1998; Miles & Huberman,

[1] At certain institutions, men and women competed on a single track and field team, which allowed us to explore the role of gender diversity within a team.

[2] NCAA reported that 41 percent of all male student athletes at Division I schools are people of color, while 24 percent of women athletes are people of color. Of the 5 schools in our study, minorities constitute 63 percent of football players, 52 percent of women basketball players, 75 percent of those in men's basketball, 52 percent of those in women's track and field, and 46 percent in men's track and field (NCAA, 1996).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1994). Although the campuses share an intense emotional and financial investment in college sports, they are different in several respects.[3]

We visited each campus in two-person teams for two or three days to gather data through interviews, focus groups, document reviews, and observations. Before visiting each campus, we secured the cooperation of the athletic department through the athletic director, whose office assisted in scheduling the interviews and focus groups. We conducted 12-15 formal interviews or focus groups on each campus, with 50-100 individuals per campus. We made particular efforts to include those who are traditionally underrepresented in intercollegiate athletics, such as women and African-American administrators and Native American, Hispanic, and Asian-Americans student-athletes. Questions about how members of teams responded to differences by race, gender, socioeconomic level, geographic region and sexual orientation were asked of all respondents, with one exception. As we learned early in our interviews, team members were likely to assert heterosexist and homophobic comments around their teammates. As such, we stopped asking about homosexuality in the larger focus groups with student athletes, as we did not want to inadvertently offend any team members who were sensitive to such issues. Instead, we explored homosexuality in single interviews with athletes, coaches and administrators.

We analyzed the interview and focus group transcripts using the constant comparative approach. Thus, we took an inductive approach to analyzing data, working to identify common themes and emerging patterns. We took appropriate measures to ensure that the derived categories were internally consistent, but distinct from one another (Marshall & Rossman, 1995;

---

[3]These include academic reputation, geographic region, size and type of local community, diversity within the local community, diversity within the campus community, general openness to diversity, diversity among student-athletes, diversity among coaches and athletics administrators, strength of tradition in athletics, resources available to athletics, and athletic department budget.

Guba, 1981). Two additional internal checks on decisions were to search throughout the analysis process for negative instances and for rival structures (Glazer & Strauss, 1967). We stopped searching for data to generate and substantiate our ideas, when all the major concepts and their interrelationships were theoretically saturated – when we could find no additional data to embellish the ideas (Conrad, 1982).

The main validity threat to descriptive understanding is inaccurate or inadequate data (Maxwell, 1996). The main threats to analytic and interpretive understanding is imposing one's own framework on the data rather than listening to the perspectives of those interviewed. To deal with these potential threats we use the following techniques: 1) searching for discrepant evidence; 2) triangulating our data; 3) conducting member checks both during the interviews and after the analysis; and, 4) describing our data richly to provide enough detailed information to provide, in Maxwell's words, "a full and revealing picture of what is going on."

So good at one form of difference, yet lousy at another

In general, we found that a remarkably strong sense of community exists between and among participants on the sports teams – teams marked by their diversity. These bonds link students across many difference, including race, socioeconomic status, and geographic background. Student-athletes, coaches, and athletics administrators suggest several ways that participation fosters community for members of teams: 1) sharing a common goal; 2) engaging in intense, frequent interaction; 3) sharing adversity in the form of hard work, suffering, and sacrifice; 4) having a common "enemy;" 5) recognizing that each individual has something important to contribute; 6) holding team members accountable; and 7) having coaches who guide them. These lessons are discussed in detail in a companion article (Wolf-Wendel, Toma, & Morphew, in press).

In contrast to our findings on the ways in which athletics seems to build community regardless of racial, socioeconomic, and geographic diversity, homosexuality remains a divisive issue in athletics. Students and coaches gave mixed responses when asked about gay or lesbian athletes on their teams. At best, those in intercollegiate athletics embraced a "don't ask, don't tell" policy. For example, one coach explained, "I don't know that we've really had *that* problem, but we don't bring it up." At worst, they were unwilling to make a place for gays and lesbians on their teams. Coaches and athletes acknowledged that gay and lesbian student-athletes existed, but insisted they played other sports. For example, one coach told us that homosexuality comes up less often in track and field and believed that it was more prevalent in other sports, while another argued that homosexuality was not an issue in her sport, because hers was a "feminine type" sport. The notion that lesbianism was prevalent in specific sports was so commonplace that at one institution, the athletic director told us that when he needed to add a new women's sports to comply with Title IX, he chose swimming over softball because the institution "didn't want to bring in a lot of *those* people."

When asked how they would deal with student-athletes who were gay or lesbian, some coaches and students said that it was a non-issue for their team because no one had come out. Others were less willing to sidestep the topic and expressed hostile reactions to the idea of homosexuals on their teams.

> We've been lucky, it [lesbianism] hasn't come here. I've heard about it. I really don't know how [I would handle it] to be honest with you [A coach].
>
> I think a goodly portion of those kinds of things get weeded out....in high school....I just don't think you get to be a junior or senior in high school and a good athlete with that kind of outward orientation [a coach].

> It would only be an issue if it became divisive—if the team split over it. For example, if one's lifestyle was being pushed on someone—as with having two camps on a team and both trying to "recruit" a first-year student [A coach].

> Myself, I can communicate with a gay person but I am not for communicating with them every day and letting them touch me. I don't want to talk about their sexual tendencies . . . that is their problem [An athlete].

There were differences between male and female respondents with regard to homosexuality. Whereas men were more likely to simply state whether they could or could not be comfortable having gay athletes on their team, women athletes and coaches recognized the stereotypes that confronted women who were athletically active. As one female coach explained:

> Believe me, I've gotten it and every female has gotten it. It's just the tag you have, 'she's a tomboy,' if you're a good athlete or whatever, your energetic, 'she's a tomboy, she has to be a lesbian,' or whatever. You get a lot of that. . . . When recruits came in with short hair . . . they [the team] welcomed them with open arms. Because I think they know how people are labeled and I guess they feel well we can't label them and society and everybody else labeling all of us.

Many of the women athletes, acknowledging that people believe all women athletes are lesbians, explained that they felt the need to separate themselves from that stereotype. One means of enhancing the separation from the label of lesbianism was to label others, particularly on other teams and at other schools, as being lesbian. Interestingly, several coaches and athletes described doing this as a means of negative recruiting – getting women athletes to choose their school over a rival. One athlete, for example, told us that during her recruitment visit to campus "the coach made it clear that there were no lesbians on the team." A coach, when asked if the issue came up in recruiting visits told us, "Yes, it is an issue in recruiting. There are some coaches in our part of the country who may use it as a negative thing....I get asked by parents almost every time."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In our study, we found only one direct exception to the negativism regarding homosexuality. The first positive sentiments we heard came from members of a women's basketball team who described a situation where several members of the team had come out. The athletes on this team explained that having one person brave enough to come out changed the environment, which allowed other student-athletes to feel more comfortable being themselves. As one athlete noted, "When I went through freshman year to junior year it changed. My freshman year people would make derogatory comments about gay people or whatever right in the locker room. It wasn't until last year that someone came out to me. It took for her to see my tolerance in order for her to confide in me."

Aside from this one setting, we also had several male athletes who indicated that they could be "forgiving" of someone who was gay or "look beyond it" if the person was truly a good athlete and an asset to the team. In this vein, the male student-athletes expressed the notion that "if that guy is a star player or something, it'll probably affect them less. But, if he's not..." Similarly, an athlete explained "it depends on how he performs on the field. If he is good and he is watching my back, then it doesn't matter." However, the athlete who made this comment also joked about the notion of a gay man "watching his back." Recently, this belief that a good athlete would be able to "get away" with coming out was tested by a high school football player in Connecticut who came out to his coaches and teammates during his senior year. Corey Johnson, a star athlete, made national news not just because he came out but also because his teammates responded positively to his announcement. In fact, both Corey and the team were awarded a Visionary Award for tolerance by the Boston Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (Reilly, 2000). The lesson to be learned from this experience, perhaps, is that the mantra repeated in athletics about "winning" being the main goal is true even when it comes to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

responding to homosexuality. However, it should be noted that the media coverage of the reaction by Corey's teammates and the few positive comments from those in our study demonstrates the rarity of such perceptions in athletics.

Examining the overall message from our results, we found there to be hostility to gays and lesbians on nearly all teams and it is clear that students, coaches, and administrators alike in athletics are generally unwilling to confront and accept homosexuality. One common response is to avoid consideration of the issue altogether, instead pointing out the presence of gays or lesbians in other sports. Another response is to argue that it would be impossible for gays or lesbians to be productive members of teams given the reaction that straight coaches and teammates would have to them. The bottom line is that as progressive and successful as people in athletics are in building community from a diverse groups in terms of race, ethnicity, geography, socioeconomic status, etc., they lag considerably in creating a supportive environment for gays and lesbians on their teams.

An attempt at theoretical explanations

The remainder of this paper attempts to explain the findings from our study by looking to existing literature. Specifically, we offer four different, though potentially intersecting, explanations for our findings. The first explanation is that athletics is a microcosm of our society. As such, the differences in how athletes respond to race compared to homosexuality can best be understood in light of the progress our society has made in responding to these issues. If this idea holds true, then as our society becomes more open to homosexuality we should expect those in athletics to make similar progress. A second, related explanation is that student athletes are more comfortable dealing with race than with homosexuality because they have had more exposure to the former. The third explanation is that those in athletics are worse at responding to

homosexuality because of the hegemonic masculinity of athletics. According to this conceptualization, the fact that athletics is so rooted in masculinity and related homosocial behavior encourages participants to be homophobic. As such, like those in the military, those in athletics have some difficult changes ahead if they are to be more accepting of differences in sexual orientation. The final idea discussed in this paper is the notion that those in athletics are not really any better at dealing with racial identity than they are at responding to homosexual identity. In other words, our prior conclusion about athletics being able to respond well to racial diversity was, at least partially, incorrect. This explanation posits that athletic teams are closed to homosexuality because being out requires one to assert his/her identity as an individual (Rhodes, 1994; Cass. 1979), which might work against team membership. In this regard, we found that those on athletic teams tend to accentuate what people share in common rather than how people are different from one another. This was true in terms of race/ethnicity as well as other forms of diversity. If this idea holds true then the solution of how to help athletes respond more favorably to difference should focus on encouraging the development of student-athletes. Each of these four explanations is explained in more detail below.

Athletics mirrors society, which is more comfortable with race than with homosexuality

Although racism and sexism are still prevalent in American society, including in intercollegiate athletics, it is difficult to conclude that we have not made some progress in their elimination. The civil rights laws of the 1960s codified enforcement of equal protection, and policies such as affirmative action in the 1970s gave expression to these ideals. In the last half of this century, Americans have essentially eliminated *de jure* discrimination and have made significant efforts toward racial and gender equality. In short, Americans have generally come to accept the ideal and practice of equality in terms of race and gender.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As American society tackled issues of race, so too did those in intercollegiate athletics, although progress was quite slow. Racial integration came earlier in the North than in the South. By the 1950s, there were a few African-Americans competing in sports like football and track in the North, although there were still cases of African American players on Northern football teams being held out of games based on the demands of Southern opponents (Watterson, 2000). In basketball, the first African American players did not compete in college basketball in conferences like the Big Ten until the early 1950s. In the South, it was 1966 before North Carolina and Davidson integrated their teams. It would not be until the 1970s that most Southern teams allowed African-Americans to compete in basketball as well as football. A turning point for the integration of athletics occurred during the 1966 NCAA Finals where the perennially powerful, but all-white Kentucky Wildcats lost to an integrated upstart team from Texas Western. Even then, however, there were quotas for the number of African-American players on a given squad, as well as unwritten limits on the number of African-Americans that could be on the court at any one time (Watterson, 2000). Today, these types of racial barriers for athletes have been eliminated. Sports had become much more of a meritocracy, raising the level of competition on the field and court. Indeed, people of color often form the majority on teams, especially in basketball, football and track and field (NCAA, 1996).

In our society, similar rights and progress for gays and lesbians have only recently begun to emerge. Although Stonewall is 30 years past, federal civil rights laws still do not include an express provision protecting people on the basis of their sexual orientation; state legislation sanctioning civil unions is just now emerging; and there is still considerable controversy associated with "coming out." At the same time, issues pertaining to homosexuality are more openly discussed than ever before and have a forum via the media that seems to have helped raise

the level of discourse about homosexuality. For example, homosexuality was raised as a major issue in all three presidential debates, and the media demonstrated public outrage at the death of Mathew Sheppard and the hateful acts engaged in by Fred Phelps. Even the airing and acclaim of such television shows as Ellen and Will & Grace have helped to elevate American society's views of homosexuality. Yet, while things are better on some fronts than they were only a few years ago, there is nothing approaching the advances American society has made in race and gender equality. And, there has been a public backlash in response to each of these steps forward. As cited earlier, heterosexism and homophobia continue to exist on college campuses throughout the country (Black, Oles & Moore, 1998; Eliason, 1997; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1997; Geasler , Croteau, Heineman, & Edlund, 1995; Geller, 1991; Schellenberg, Hirt & Sears, 1999; Simoni, 1996).

Interestingly, the same arguments that opponents of desegregation and women's rights used two and three decades ago are being used in opposition to inclusion of gay and lesbian in the mainstream, including in intercollegiate athletics. Just as people argued that including people of color would destroy unit cohesion and camaraderie in groups such as teams, they now argue this about gays and lesbians participating openly. The military provides an apt example. Desegregation in service units was controversial in the 1940s, as was the introduction of women into life at places like Annapolis and West Point in the 1970s. Both groups are have now fully integrated. The debate over the role of openly gay or lesbian military personnel of the 1990s may very well run the same course.

Respondents in the present study, when faced with explaining why some forms of difference could be overcome via having a common goal while other differences were more insurmountable, indicated that the reason was based on societal acceptance of these two forms of

difference. For example, one coach explained, "Social attitudes about race are further along than about sexual orientation." Similarly, an athletic administrator noted, "Sexual orientation attitudes are changing in the undergraduate population at large and consequently in the athletic student population." Still another coach commented, "It's a much healthier situation in 1999, then it was in 1989, then it was in 1979. There is no question that it is a far more volatile issue with a lot of people than the other is [race]. . . . but I am seeing it change."

All of this suggests that we are simply not as far along as a society, including in intercollegiate athletics, in the recognition of homosexuality as we are in understanding and accommodating racial and gender difference. Our history provides us with some cause for optimism, however. It took decades for race to become a less pronounced issue in sports, as is the experience with gender. Today, we can at least say that formal barriers to participation for athletes of color has fallen, and inequalities in opportunity and funding in women's intercollegiate sports are being discussed and addressed, however incrementally. It is safe to say that issues of may move along the same path as they are discussed and slowly resolved or, at least, accommodated. At the same time, those of us in higher education at large and in athletics more specifically, ought not to use the problems of society as an excuse for inaction. Rather, we should look for ways to model more positive views about all forms of difference on our campuses.

Athletes have more exposure to racial differences than to homosexuality

Several scholars have hypothesized that increased contact between groups, under certain circumstances, can help eliminate prejudice and stereotypes (Allport, 1954; Sherif, 1961). As such, one of the reasons racial integration has advanced in athletics when inclusion of gays and lesbians has lagged is that there is a critical mass of people of color on teams. Gay and lesbian

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

athletes are likely to be outnumbered on teams as compared to racial minorities, who are actually a majority on many teams, particularly in football, basketball, and track. In addition, racial and ethnic differences are more obvious than are differences in sexual orientation. In fact, because out gays and lesbians are practically unheard of in athletics, it is likely that athletes are exposed to gay athletes without being aware of it (Hekma, 1998). As a result, the benefits of positive interaction with homosexuals do not accrue to many members of athletic teams, whereas the benefits of exposure to members of different racial groups does occur.

As we noted earlier, we interviewed members of one women's basketball team in which several athletes had come out. Members of this team were the only group of athletes in our study to express positive views about homosexuality. This demonstrates the results of Tarricone's (1999) research, in which she concluded that because of exposure, participants in team sports become less homophobic if someone on the team comes out. Indeed, as few gay athletes come out while in college, fewer heterosexual athletes are exposed to this form of difference, making the reduction of prejudice and heterosexism even more unlikely. Again, this creates a Catch-22 situation.

It is important to note that the problem of exposure is not one that should be laid at the feet of gay and lesbian students. Rather, it is the negative environment created by those in athletics that makes it difficult, if not impossible, for gay and lesbian athletes to feel comfortable enough to come out. As such, it is the environment that needs to change to allow a safe and comfortable climate that allows community members to express their individuality and come out, or not, as they choose. Athletics might well be the ultimate "prison of heterosexual norms produced by silence" discussed in Rhodes study of the coming out process (1994, p. 76). To

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

remedy the problem, the prison doors must be opened and those who have power must learn to listen and those who are silenced must be allowed to speak.

Athletics Embodies Hegemonic Masculinity

Athletes may view homosexuality more negatively than other forms of difference because athletics emphasizes masculinity, which is seen to be in sharp contrast to homosexuality. This hypothesis is consistent with Connell's (1987) definition of athletics as embodying "hegemonic masculinity," which he defines as the most valued form on masculinity because it separates men and women's spheres and designates the latter as lesser. "Collision sports" and other team sports are seen as bastions of masculinity because of the violence that is integral to these sports (Crosset, 1990; Messner, 1990; Connell, 1987). Men who participate in these sports are by definition not only masculine, but are also seen as heroes. Enduring pain and experiencing exhaustion and collapse without regard to present or future ramifications is, in fact, a badge of honor in American sport – especially in college sports. These values are also associated with manliness – which is another important value in both sport and society and is especially pronounced in the world of intercollegiate athletics (Eitzen and Sage, Connell, 1987). The coaches and athletes we spoke with often argued that homosexuality – especially in males – was incongruent with the masculine nature of athletics. For example, one coach told us that "guys are known as sissies if they are that way," when referring to gay student-athletes.

This notion that persons who participate in athletics are, by definition, masculine, is important for several reasons. First of all, it threatens the legitimacy of women athletes and their sports. According to Eitzen and Sage (1997), male dominance is perpetuated in sport through simply defining sport as a male activity. As a result, women athletes and women's sports are routinely belittled and diminished. At all levels of competition, women also receive much less

public attention than do men, as well as less budgetary support and access to facilities. Moreover, men typically control sports – both for men and women – particularly at the intercollegiate level where the vast majority of senior athletics administrators and coaches of women's teams are men. The masculinity of athletics has been used to explain why many female athletes, particularly those that are good at their sports, are labeled as lesbian (Kidd, 1990; Nelson, 1994; Parisot, 1998).

The second reason that the masculine nature of sports is important here is because of the inconsistency between this notion and the intimacy that athletes – particularly male athletes – experience as a result of athletics. Working together against adversity and toward common goals brings people on a team together in ways that cause them to care about each other. There remain boundaries, however. Compassion for a teammate is thought to be wholly apart from sexuality. Yet, we see evidence of intimate behaviors in athletics that go beyond what would be acceptable in many other environments, especially for males. Examples of these kinds of behaviors include hand-holding, butt-slapping, and the exchange of hugs that often occur simultaneously between teammates.

Faludi (1999), in her book on American men's lives, offers an interesting parallel to athletics in her description of male cadets at the Citadel. Faludi describes the relationship between the cadets as one characterized by homosocial behavior. Specifically, she chronicles a variety of acts engaged in by the cadets that, from an external perspective, have homosexual overtones, but that are not viewed in such terms by the cadets themselves. She describes, for example, men showering together, patting each other affectionately on the rear, crying on each other's shoulders and performing an act called "the tuck." "The tuck requires that a cadet unzip his pants halfway and fold down his waistband, then stand still while his helper approaches him

from the back, puts his arms around the cadet's waist, pulls the loose shirt material firmly to the back, jams it as far down in the pants as he can, and the pulls the cadet's pants up" (p. 128). The underlying message to be gained from the tuck, according to a cadet is "you can't do it yourself—you need your classmates to do it for you. There's really a lot of dependence upon your classmates" (p. 128). In her analysis of the cadets she concludes, "private tenderness was allowed only to those who publicly promoted their contempt for homosexual love" (p. 127). The parallel between this environment and that found on men's team sports seems obvious – men coming together to form a team engage in intimacy which makes them express homophobic sentiments.

If, as some scholars suggest, athletics is inextricably linked with masculinity, then it shouldn't be surprising that anything that is perceived to threaten that notion will be feared or viewed with hostility (Dworkin & Wachs, 1998; Harry, 1995; Whitson, 1990). To remedy this problem will be difficult, unless one can strip away the hegemonic masculinity of sports or the stereotypes associated with homosexuality. Nonetheless, one way to combat something is to understand it more fully. As such, continued research and exploration about the relationship between athletics and gender roles is essential if we are to make progress in helping those in athletics think about these issues differently.

Athletics Inhibits Individual Identity In Its Efforts To Achieve Conformity

One could hypothesize that the ability of those in athletics to respond to racial/ethnic difference positively is merely an illusion and that, in fact, those in athletics are no better at responding to racial differences than they are at responding to homosexuality. In other words, athletics can deal positively with superficial differences among athletes, but not with deeper differences that occur as students develop a unique sense of self. The basis for this argument

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

rests on the environment within athletics that emphasizes conformity rather than individuality. Coaches have traditionally been able to require that student-athletes conform to typically conservative team norms – norms that do not recognize the presence of discrimination in sports. Moreover, the self is commonly subordinate to the team for student-athletes – there is no "I" in "TEAM," the saying goes. Order and control – values generally understood by Americans to be important in areas such as business and government – are thought by coaches to be essential to success on the field or court (Oriard, 1993). Indeed, our data suggests that the environment in Division I intercollegiate athletics may inhibit individual identity development as a means of emphasizing the notions of team, cooperation and community. As such, we suggest that athletes are not encouraged, and may be actively discouraged from proceeding along the stages of identity development, whether it be homosexual identity development or racial identity development. Examining a few of the identity theories and the power they give to the role of environment as a factor that supports or inhibits development illustrates this point.

Cass (1979) explains that homosexual identity development is influenced by a number of factors including the similarity of dissimilarity between an individual's self-perceptions and the perceptions of others. Growth in identity formation occurs when a person resolves an inconsistency between a self perceived characteristic, a perception of one's behavior, and the perceptions of others views about the behavior. According to Cass's theory, individuals progress through six stages of development: 1) identity confusion, 2) identity comparison, 3) identity tolerance, 4) identity acceptance, 5) identity pride, and 6) identity synthesis. Individuals who find themselves in more supportive environments are likely to progress more easily along these stages. In contrast, Cass suggests that an environment that is unsupportive, or hostile, is likely to impede an individual's development. Given the negative views expressed regarding

homosexuality by athletes, coaches and athletic directors in the present study it is not surprising that there are relatively few homosexual intercollegiate athletes who are out and who have progressed beyond the second stage of Cass' theory. Successful progression through the stages, according to Cass, necessitates a supportive climate, which isn't present in athletics.

One could look at racial identity developmental theories and draw a similar conclusion. Athletes at Division I institutions are not necessarily encouraged to develop their sense of racial consciousness. In contrast to homosexuality, racial differences are typically visible, making it "unnecessary" for athletes to "come out" as black. In other words, while athletes indicated that they were able to work with people from different racial/ethnic backgrounds, they didn't necessarily mean that they were comfortable dealing with people for whom race is a major facet of their identity. Examining Cross' (1991) model of psychological nigrescence helps to explain this idea. Cross suggests that African American students go through several stages in developing a sense of racial identity. These stages include: preencounter, encounter, immersion-emersion, internalization, internalization-commitment. It appeared from our interviews that few athletes had ventured beyond the preencounter phase, in that they seemed to view the world as being race-neutral. For example, while many of the black coaches we interviewed noted the underrepresentation of people of color among the coaching and administrative ranks, few, if any African American athletes, made similar observations. Indeed, they didn't seem to see differences in the ways that whites and blacks are treated in athletics or in the campus at large. Further evidence of this point comes from the finding that many athletes, both white and black, made statements that minimized differences between racial and ethnic groups. For example, the sentiment "I don't care if you are blue, green, purple, black or white, as long as you can play ball" was expressed by a large number of athletes, as well as coaches and athletic administrators.

Further, white athletes too did not seem to have a well developed sense of racial identity as described by Helms (1993) in that they have no clear understanding of what it means to be white or of the racist nature of our society.

In fact, the emphasis on team, cooperation, and community may inhibit athletes from developing their own sense of identity as separate individuals. The reality is that like many others in society the athletes and coaches we interviewed did not work to create a supportive environment for homosexual students to come out, express their differences, and develop as individuals. At the same time, those in athletics do not encourage any team member to explore his or her individual identity. In some ways, this stance is not unique to athletics. Several critics of higher education have argued that emphasizing differences between individuals and among groups leads to "self-segregation" and works against creating community (D'Souza, 1995; Schlesinger, 1995). Even within the gay community, there are those who argue that gay pride parades and "coming out day" hinder rather than help homosexuals because these events emphasize homosexuals' differences from heterosexuals (Bawer, 1993). This idea, in fact, was expressed by many of the respondents in our study. Specifically, athletes told us that they didn't have a problem with homosexuals as long as they didn't act differently or behave differently than other athletes. For example, one athlete told us he didn't understand why gays felt the need to openly express their difference: "I don't understand why there is a gay march. If you are gay, it is fine, no one cares who you are sleeping with." Others told us that as long as they didn't know a fellow athlete was gay, sexual orientation wouldn't be a problem. "I think it would be hard for us to know that he was gay – unless he told us…personally it wouldn't bother me as long as he can play and as long as he is dealing it in an [appropriate] manner," one athlete suggested.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

At the same time, however, there are problems with this conceptualization of difference as a phenomenon that should be ignored to facilitate community. Specifically, many researchers and scholars have recognized the importance of group identification in addressing community and in facilitating individual student development. These scholars suggest that rather than problematizing the need of individuals to assert their identity and spend time with those who are like them, we need to find ways that bring students from different groups together in meaningful ways while still allowing people to gather periodically "in comfort zones of shared experiences, identities and concerns" (Cortes, 1991, p. 11; Montero, 1995; Tatum, 1997). At the same time, as Tierney (1997) asks, "[I]s there any evidence that groups who are discriminated against have a better chance to lessen their stigma and attain their rights if they try to act as the mainstream does?" (p. 50). In other words, there is no evidence to suggest that if gay and lesbian athletes do not emphasize their differences from the mainstream that other athletes will be respectful of them. In fact, our research study demonstrates the opposite – those in athletics are openly hostile to gays and lesbians regardless of their actions or inaction.

Conclusion

The results and musings in this paper are important for several reasons. First, there is ample evidence that an unsupportive environment can be detrimental to gays and lesbians, regardless of whether they are in or out of the closet. Rhodes (1994), for example, describes cases in which homosexuals consider suicide, face depression, feel isolated and alone, fear for their own physical safety, and generally experience undue anxiety when faced with a hostile environment. Further, Krane (1996), in her study of lesbians in athletics, found that the athletic environment contributed to their low self-esteem, low confidence, high stress and substance abuse. Similarly, Rotella and Murray (1991) explain that homosexual athletes experience

negative psychological ramifications of homophobia and heterosexism experienced in athletics. Lest those in athletics believe that homophobia and heterosexism are not relevant to their goals of winning, Krane (1996) also found that a negative environment for lesbians can negatively affect athletic performance. Similarly, a student athlete explained, "If someone is thinking and feeling unaccepted by others on the team, it has to take away from his/her performance. By understanding each individual and accepting them for who they are, athletes will be able to use each other for a source of strength instead of a source of fear" (Rotella & Murray, 1991, p. 359). Given the likelihood that gays and lesbians are found in athletics in at least equal proportion to their presence in the rest of society, this is an issue that ought to be taken seriously.

While this paper attempts to explain why those in athletics are homophobic and heterosexist, this should not be interpreted as a means to "excuse" these beliefs or actions. Rather, our approach to this paper lies in the notion that understanding why something is occurring might help us to change attitudes and behaviors. In fact, this paper can be important to all coaches, athletes and athletic administrators, regardless of sexual orientation, if one believes that part of the purpose of college is to make people more accepting of differences. As Tierney (1993) asks, "How is it possible to construct a community based on difference, if we do not enable those who are different to speak?"

While the application of these theoretical lenses may have helped us to understand the contrast between the ways in which students and coaches approach other differences as compared with homosexuality, they do not provide remedies. So, the question remains: How can we help student athletes and coaches to adopt more inclusive attitudes toward homosexuals? This is difficult because there are no easy solutions. If athletics mirrors society in its acceptance of homosexuality, we cannot expect athletes or others on campus to become comfortable and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

accepting of homosexuality overnight. But, we can work to enact some of the same types of approaches that have served us well in our efforts to combat racism on campus. As such, we can work to make sure that formal and informal policies don't serve as barriers to homosexuals attaining leadership positions on campus and we can lobby to include sexual orientation in civil rights policies on the campus level and in legislation at the state and federal levels. One real life example of this was cited by the Oberlin athletics director in a recent article. He noted the addition of sexual orientation to the nondiscrimination clause in the NCAA's charter (Muska, 2000). These kinds of policy changes may help to make explicit and formalize the legitimacy of homosexuals in athletics, just as civil rights legislation did for members of minority groups.

In the same vein, the other perspectives investigated in this paper suggest appropriate responses. Although we understand that we cannot require student athletes (or others on campus) to interact with persons whom they know are homosexuals, we can work to create a climate that is supportive of homosexual students' coming out. If we are able to do this, we accomplish the goal of increased interaction indirectly because as the number of "out" homosexuals on campus increases, interactions between these students and others on campus will occur. And, while we may not be able to change the aura of masculinity surrounding athletics, we can work to overcome homosexual stereotypes, thus diluting the charges that the idea of a gay football player is paradoxical. For example, as Muska (2000) suggests "open discussions with our athletes, as well as campus visits by former athletes who came out after graduating (we all have them)" would serve to address this issue.

Finally, educating coaches and athletic administrators about identity development theories and ways to assist their students in making progress through these stages may encourage more student athletes to progress through the stages of identity development. Just as we expect

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

student affairs administrators to apply their knowledge of these theories to the general student population, we can help coaches and athletic administrators to see these educative duties as part of their role. While some may fear that this will work against the notion of team in the short-run, we in education believe that fostering student development is an essential part of the collegiate process and may help to foster a deeper sense of community. Moreover, our interviews with coaches led us to believe that they genuinely care about student-athletes and would welcome opportunities to help them grow.

In the end, each of the lenses applied above can help us to better understand what goals we should have if we truly want to confront and change the homophobic and heterosexist environments found in athletic departments and many other areas of the academy.

References

Allport, G. (1954). The Nature of Prejudice. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing .

Bailey, W. and Littleton, T. (1991). Athletics and Academe: An Anatomy of Abuses and a Prescription for Reform. Phoenix: Oryx Press, ACE-Oryx Series on Higher Education.

Bawer, B. (1993). A Place at the Table: The Gay Individual in American Society. New York: Poseidon.

Black, B., Oles, T. P., & Moore, L. (1998). The relationship between attitudes: Homophobia and sexism among social work students. Afflia, 13(2), 166-189.

Cady, E. (1978). The Big Game: College Sports in American Life. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Calderwood, P. (2000). Learning Community: Finding Common Ground in Difference. New York: Teachers College Press.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990). Campus Life: In Search of Community. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. Journal of Homosexuality, 4(3), 219-235.

Chu, D. & Griffey, D. C. (1981). Sport and racial integration: The relationship of personal contact, attitudes and behavior. In Dunleavy, A. O, Miracle, A. W., & Rees, C. R. (Eds.), Studies in the Sociology of Sport. Refereed Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Conference of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport. Fort Worth, TX, November 1981. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Connell, R. W. (1987). Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W. (1990). An iron man: The body and some contradictions of hegemonic masculinity. In M. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, Men and the Gender Order. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Conrad, C. (1982). Grounded theory: an alternative approach to research in higher education. Review of Higher Education, 5, 239-249.

Creswell, J. (1994). Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, W. E. (1991). Shades of Black: Diversity in African American Identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Crosset, T. (1990). Masculinity, sexuality, and the development of early modern sport. In M. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, Men and the Gender Order. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

D'Augelli, A. (1989). Lesbians' and gay men's experience of discrimination and harassment in a university community. American Journal of Community Psychology, 17, 317-321.

Dundes, A. (1985). The American game of "smear the queer" and the homosexual component of male competitive sport and warfare. Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology, 8(3), 115-129.

Dworkin, S. L. & Wachs, F. L. (1998). Disciplining the body: HIV positive male athletes, media surveillance, and the policing of sexuality. Sociology of Sport Journal, 15, 1-20.

Eitzen, D. S., & Sage, G. H. (1997). Sociology of North American Sports, 6th ed. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark Publishers.

Eliason, M. J. (1997). The prevalence and nature of biphobia in heterosexual undergraduate students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 26(3), 317-326.

Engstrom, C. M. & Sedlacek, W. (1997). Attitudes of heterosexual students towards their gay and lesbian peers. Journal of College Student Development, 38(6), 565-576.

Faludi, S. (1999). Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Geasler, M. J., Croteau, J. M., Heineman, C. J., & Edlund, C. J. (1995). A qualitative study of students' expression of change after attending panel presentations by lesbian, gay and bisexual speakers. Journal of College Student Development, 36(5), 483-492.

Geller, W. W. (1991). Attitudes towards gays and lesbians: A longitudinal study. Farmington, ME: University of Maine at Farmington. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service # ED 340970).

Glazer, B. and Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Guba, E. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. Educational Communications and Technology Journal, 29, 75-92.

Harry, J. (1995). Sports ideology, attitudes toward women and anti-homosexual attitudes. Sex Roles, 32 (1-2), 109-116.

Hekma, G. (1998). "As long as they don't make an issue of it...." Gay men and lesbians in organized sports in the Netherlands. Journal of Homosexuality, 35(1), 1-23.

Helms, J. E. (1993). Black and white racial identity. Theory, research and practice. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Herek G. (1993). Documenting prejudice against lesbians and gay men on campus: The Yale sexual orientation survey. Journal of Homosexuality, 25(4), 15-30.

Kidd, B.. (1988). Sports and masculinity, In M. Kaufman (Ed.), Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change. New York: Oxford University Press.

Krane, V. (1996). Lesbians in sport: toward acknowledgement, understanding and theory. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 18, 237-246.

La Mar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. The Journal of Sex Research, 35(2), 198-196.

Levine, A (1983). "Diversity on Campus" In Levine, A., (Ed.). Higher Learning in America: 1980-2000. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Levine, A., and Cureton, J. S. (1998). When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lincoln, Y. S., and Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (1995). Designing qualitative research. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McClendon, M. J., & Eitzen, D. S. (1975). Interracial contact on collegiate basketball teams: A test of Sherif's theory of superordinate goals. Social Science Quarterly, 55(4), 926-938.

Messner, M. A. (1990). Masculinities and athletic careers: Bonding and status differences. In M. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, Men and the Gender Order. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Miles, M., and Huberman, A. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miracle, A. W. (1981). Factors affecting interracial cooperation: A case study of a high school football team. Human Organization, 40(2), 150-154.

Muska, M. (2000). Reflections of a gay athletic director. The Chronicle Review, 10/13/2000, B10.

NCAA (1996). NCAA Division I graduation-rates reports. Overland Park, Kansas: author.

Nelson, M. B. (1994). The Stronger Women Get, the More Men Love Football: Sexism and the American Culture of Sports. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Oriard, M. (1993). Reading Football: How the Popular Press Created and American Spectacle. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Parisot, D. (1998). Condescension and tolerance with regard to sexual role transgressions in sport. Paper presented at the International Sociological Association Annual Meeting.

Reilly, R. (2000). The biggest play of his life. CNN Sports Illustrated.com.

Rhodes, R. (1994). Coming out in College: The Struggle for a Queer Identity. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rodrigues, R. P. (1993). Role conflict and sexual orientation of female college athletes. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Rotella, R. J. & Murray, M. (1991). Homophobia, the world of sport, and sport psychology consulting. Sport Psychologist, 5(4), 355-364.

Schellenberg, E. G., Hirt, J. & Sears, A. (1999). Attitudes toward homosexuals among students at a Canadian university. Sex Roles, 40(1 &2), 139-152.

Sherif, M. et al. (1961). Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment. Norman: The University of Oklahoma Book Exchange.

Scott, E. S., & Damico, S. B. (1984). Extracurricular activities and interracial contact. Integrated Education, 21(1-6), 140-142.

Sigelman, L. & Welch, S. (1993). The contact hypothesis revisited: Black-White interaction and positive racial attitudes. Social Forces, 71(3), 781-795.

Simoni, J. M. (1996). Pathways to prejudice: Predicting student's' heterosexist attitudes with demographics, and contact with lesbians and gay men. Journal of College Student Development 37(1), 68-78.

Smith, D. G. (1995). Organizational implications of diversity in higher education. In M. Chemers et al (Eds.), Diversity in Organizations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Tarricone, D. (1999). Relationship between homophobia and worldview with respect to attitudes and perceptions of women in sport. Unpublished dissertation.

Tierney, W. G. (1993). Building Communities of Difference: Higher Education in the Twenty-first Century. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tierney, W.G. (1997). Academic Outlaws: Queer Theory and Cultural Studies in the Academy. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Toma, J. D., & Cross, M. (2000). Contesting values in American higher education: The playing field of intercollegiate athletics. In J. Smart, ed., Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. 15, 406-55. New York: Agathon Press.

Watterson, J. S. (2000). College Football: History, Spectacle, Controversy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Whitson, D. (1990). Sport in the social construction of masculinity. In M. Messner & D. Sabo (Eds.), Sport, Men and the Gender Order. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Wolf-Wendel, L. E., Toma, J. D., & Morphew, C. C. (in press). There's No "I" in Team . . . And Other Lessons from Intercollegiate Athletics in Building Communities from Difference. Review of Higher Education.